

**REMARKS**

This fifth supplemental amendment follows an interview graciously granted by the Examiner. An interview summary follows.

In the Amendment, independent claims 79, 100, 149 and 159 have been amended. Dependent claims 80, 81 and 101 have also been amended.

The telephone interview conducted today was initiated by Applicant and included the inventor, John Kim, Applicant's representative, John McConaghy, and Examiner Tran. Applicant pointed out the points of novelty in the independent claims as follows:

79. Applicant asserted priority to 1997 with novelty being the emergency function.
100. The novelty being the recitations with a satellite phone.
138. The novelty being the flash memory in a specific socket – the socket having no card carrier but having an engagement in socket/a spring in socket/and asymmetry in socket.
149. A. cell/satellite phone stores and transmits moving images to internet/phone/computer
157. A camera with the flash memory card and socket of claim 138.

The Examiner responded by indicating that the receipt of moving images was not disclosed in the 1997 priority application. Further, there may need to be a restriction if claim 79 is amended to remove the restriction as claim 159 has such restrictions as well. Applicant responded that claim 79 will be amended this same day to exclude the material asserted to be new matter. Applicant also wanted to take out reference to the modem as that did not appear to be part of the novelty consideration here and the claim may be argued to be narrowed by that unnecessary recitation. The promise of an amendment today concluded the interview.

By the present Amendment, Applicant intends to have claim 79 reflect only subject matter of the 1997 priority application and to no longer include the limitation of the modem previously recited. Amendments to claims 100 and 149 delete reference to the modem as well. Other amendments to scope of the claims are off issue regarding the interview.

Applicant also wishes to point out that claim 159 does not recite any limitation of data receipt from a remote phone. Rather interaction with the internet is recited. Therefore, a restriction does not appear provoked by this claim.

Entry of the above amendment is requested along with further consideration of the amended claims.

Respectfully submitted,



---

John D. McConaghy  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 26,773

Date: November 19, 2008

CUSTOMER NUMBER  
**58688**  
U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP**  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Suite 2300  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 787-2500